



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/606,923	06/29/2000	Sarita M. James	204498	6699

23460 7590 03/04/2003

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

5

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/606,923

Applicant(s)

JAMES ET AL.

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 0200.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-2, 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mein et al(US. Patent 6,457,066 B1)

As to claim 1, Mein teaches an application (software application, col 5, In 60-67/ client-side, col 3, In 28-67), a remote server (col 3, In 28-67), the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP)(SOAP/ col 3, In 28-67), a call (method call, col 5, In 12-39/ col 6, In 7-5), a SOAP request (a SOAP request, col 3, In 28-67/ an HTTP POST message, col 5, In 2-39), the procedure (the name or progid col 6, In 7-65), the body of the SOAP request (the body, col 6, In 7-35), a set of the parameter (parameters, col 6, In 7-67), status information(document containing a certain data, col 2, In 34-48), response information(their contain, col 2, In 34-48), the query (a query, col 1, In 34-48).

Mein does not explicit teach the term " the query the SOAP request". However, Mein the query might represent a request...(col 1, In 34-48). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Mein in order to transfer a larger number of requests to the server for processing.

As to claim 2, Mein teaches a header (header, col 6, In 7-67), a value for the i nustUnderstand attribuder (the program ID, col 6, In 47-64).

As to claim 4, a software object (data structure, col 3, In 28-67). call (method call, c of 6, In 7-65), method (col 5, In 12-39/ col 6, In 7-65).

As to claim 5, Mein teaches issuing (insues, col 5, In 12-39), the application (the c lient process, col 5, In 12-39), a call (a method call, col 5, In 12-39), the SOAP request software object (the data structure as an HTTP post message, col 5, In 12-39).

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 6, Mein teaches a SOAP request (a SOAP request col 3, In 28-67/ IITTP post message, col 5, In 12-39), a procedure (the name of the server computer 30, a progid... col 6, In 7-65), the remote server (the server, col 6, In 7-65), the body of the SOAP request (a body 320, col 6, In 7-65), set of parameters, col 6, In 7-65), status information (document containing a certain data, col 2, In 34-48), response information (their contain, col 2, In 34-48), the query (a query, col 1, In 34-48).

Mein does not explicit teach the term " the query the SOAP request". However, ~,4ein the query might represent a request...(col 1, In 34-48). It would have been obvious t3 apply the teaching of Mein in order to transfer a larger number of requests to the server for processing.

As to claim 7, Mein teaches a client application (a client process, col 4, In 20-27). the local host (a local client computer, col 4, In 20-27), the remote host (the remoter server, col 4, In 27-40), a communication link (internet 20, Fig. 1), a SOAP request (col 3, In 28-67/ HTTP post message, col 5, In 12-39), status (the process of packaging up the rata, col 3, In 48-68), response information (return parameter, col 3. In 28-67), a set of function (a particular function, col 5, In 51-55/ a method, col 6, In 7-67).

Mein does not explicit teach term " a set of function running ...on the local..". However, Mein teaches during running of the client ...the application make a method call (col 6, In 7-22)/ performing a particular function. It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Mein in order to provide functions :For creating requests by the client side, nd that function must be running on the client side.

Art Unit: 2151

2. Claims 3, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mein et al(US. Patent 6,457,066 B1) in view of Robins et al (US. Patent 6,115,744)

As to claim 3, Mein does not explicit teach the SOAP request be sent ... does not return until response information is received from. set amount of time passes. However, Robins teaches reply monitor(col 9, In 50-67 to col 10, In 1-37).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Robins to Mein in order to generate an monitor rely messages to the client application

As to claim 8, Mein does not teach a set of function is an applicationprogramming interface (API). However, Robins teaches API 144(cot 11, In 1-48).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Ronbins to Mein in order to snake the programming task for the client application is greatly simplified.

As to claim 9, Mein teaches form of parameters (parameter, cot 5, In 12-39/ cot 6, 1 n 7-67).

As to claim 10, it would have been obvious that the API consist essentially of software object. The API consists functions of software object

As to claim 11, Mein teaches a SOAP request (a SOAP request (a SOAP request, c of 3, In 28-67/ an HTTP POST message, cot 5, In 12-39), method (cot 5, In 12-39/ cot 6, In 7-65), a remote server (the server computer 30, cot 5, In 12-39/ cot 6. In 7-67), response information (the document, cot 2, In 34-48/return parameter, cot 3, In 28-67), status information (the SOAP request, cot 3, In 48-63/ multipart MINE packets, cot 7, In 4-39/ cot 5, In 40-60/ method call, cot 22-35).

Art Unit: 2151

Mein does not teach the API consists ... software object. However, Ronbins t--ach. However, Robins teaches API 144(col 11, In 1-48). API function (cot 12, In 36c.6).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Ronbins to Mein in order to r lake the programming task for the client application is greatly simplified.

As to a computer-readable of claim 12, see the rejection of claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 11,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mein et al(US. Patent 6,457,066 B1) in view of Hynbo Cho (RPC-based Web Services)

As to claim 11, Mein teaches a SOAP request (a SOAP request (a SOAP request, col 3, In 28-67/ an HTTP POST message, cot 5, In 12-39), method (cot 5, In 12-39/ cot 6, 1 1 7-65), a remote server (the server computer 30, col 5, In 12-39/ cot 6, In 7-67), r--sponse information (the document, cot 2, In 34-48/return parameter, cot 3, In 28-67/ a r--sulting HTTP Response message, cot 5,ln 40-50), status information (the SOAP r-quest, cot 3, In 48-63/ multipart MINE packets, cot 7, In 34-39/ cot 5, In 40-60/ method call, cot 22-35).

Mein does not teach the API consists ... software object. However, Cho teaches ,OAP API (page 6 (Public Registry Opeation)/ SOAP ... through the Java APIs, Page 2 0), an application-programming interface (API) that exposes the function of the registry (page 2).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Cho to Mein in order to enable businesses to quickly, easily, and dynamically find and transact with one another.

As to a computer-readable of claim 12, see the rejection of claim 11.

4.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2151

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Fax phone: AFTER_FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-2738, OFFICAL faxes must be signed and send to: (703) 746-7239, NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 9000.

LeChi Truong
February 24, 2003



ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100